Machine Learning manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Network of Bandits insure Privacy of end-users

Raphaël Féraud

Received: date / Accepted: date

arXiv:1602.03779v12 [cs.AI] 6 Feb 2017

Abstract In order to distribute the best arm identification task as close as possible to the user's devices, on the edge of the Radio Access Network, we propose a new problem setting, where distributed players collaborate to find the best arm. This architecture guarantees privacy to end-users since no events are stored. The only thing that can be observed by an adversary through the core network is aggregated information across users. We provide a first algorithm, Distributed Median Elimination, which is near optimal both in terms of number of transmitted bits in terms of number of pulls per player. This first algorithm requires the distribution of players to be known. Extended Distributed Median Elimination overcomes this limitation, by playing in parallel different instances of Distributed Median Elimination and selecting the best one. Experiments illustrate and complete the analysis. According to the analysis, in comparison to Median Elimination performed on each player, the proposed algorithm shows significant practical improvements.

Keywords privacy, distributed algorithm, multi-armed bandits, best arm identification, PAC learning, sample complexity.

1 Motivation

Big data systems store billions of events generated by end-users. Machine learning algorithms are then used for instance to infer intelligent mobile phone applications, to recommend products and services, to optimize the choice of ads, to choose the best human machine interface, to insure self-care of set top boxes... In this context of massive storage and massive usage of models inferred from personal data, privacy is an issue. Even if individual data are anonymized, the pattern of data associated with an individual is itself uniquely identifying. The k-anonymity approach [Sweeney (2002)] provides a guarantee to resist to direct linkage between stored data and the individuals. However, this approach can be vulnerable to

Raphaël Féraud
Orange Labs, 2, avenue Pierre Marzin, 22307, Lannion, France
E-mail: raphael.feraud@orange.com

composition attacks: an adversary could use side information that combined with the k-anonymized data allows to retrieve a unique identifier [Ganta et al (2008)]. Differential privacy [Sarwate and Chaudhuri (2013)] provides an alternative approach. The sensitive data are hidden. The guarantee is provided by algorithms that allow to extract information from data. An algorithm is differentially private if the participation of any record in the database does not alter the probability of any outcome by very much. The flaw of this approach is that, sooner or later, the sensitive data may be hacked by an adversary. Here, we propose to use a radical approach to insure privacy, that is a narrow interpretation of *privacy by design*.

Firstly, the useful information is inferred from the stream without storing data. As in the case of *differential privacy*, this *privacy by design* approach needs specific algorithms to infer useful information from the data stream. A lot of algorithms have been developed for stream mining, and most business needs can be handled without storing data: basic queries and statistics can be done on the data stream [Babcock et al (2002)], as well as online classification [Domingos and Hulten (2002)], online clustering [Beringer et Hüllermeier (2002)], and the more challenging task of decision making using contextual bandits [Chu et al (2011), Féraud et al (2016)]. However, even if the data are not stored, the guarantee is not full: an adversary could intercept the data, then stores and deciphers it.

Secondly, to make the interception of data as expensive as possible for an adversary, we propose to locally process the personal data, benefiting from a new network architecture. For increasing the responsiveness of mobile phone services and applications, network equipment vendors and mobile operators specified a new network architecture: Mobile Edge Computing (MEC) provides IT and cloud computing capabilities within the Radio Access Network in close proximity to devices [MEC white paper (2014)]. In addition to facilitate the distribution of interactive services and applications, the distribution of machine learning algorithms on MEC makes the interception task more difficult. As the data are locally processed, the adversary has to locally deploy and maintain technical devices or software to intercept and decipher the radio communication between devices and MEC servers.

2 Related works

Most of applications necessitate to take and optimize decisions with a partial feedback. That is why this paper focuses on a basic block which is called *multi-armed bandits* (MAB). In its most basic formulation, it can be stated as follows: there are K decisions, each having an unknown distribution of bounded rewards. At each step, one has to choose a decision and receives a reward. The performance of a MAB algorithm is assessed in term of *regret* (or opportunity loss) with regards to the unknown optimal decision. Optimal solutions have been proposed to solve this problem using a stochastic formulation in [Auer et al (2002)a], using a Bayesian formulation in [Kaufman et al (2012)], or using an adversarial formulation in [Auer et al (2002)b]. While these approaches focus on the minimization of the expected regret, the (ϵ, δ)-best-arm identification, based on the PAC setting [Vailant (1984)], focuses on the sample complexity (i.e. the number of time steps) needed to find an ϵ-approximation of the best arm with a failure probability of δ. This formulation has been studied for best arm identification problem in [Even-Dar et al (2002),

Bubeck et al (2009), Gabillon et al (2013)], for dueling bandit problem in [Urvoy et al (2013)], for linear bandit problem in [Soare et al (2014)], and for the contextual bandit problem in [Féraud et al (2016)].

Recent years have seen an increasing interest for the study of the collaborative distribution scheme: N players collaborate to solve a multi-armed bandit problem. The distribution of non-stochastic experts has been studied in [Kanade et al (2012)]. The distribution of stochastic multi-armed bandits has been studied for peer to peer network in [Szörényi et al (2013)]. In [Hillel et al (2013)], the analysis of the distributed exploration is based on the sample complexity need to find the best arm with an approximation factor ϵ. When only one communication round is allowed, an algorithm with an optimal speed-up factor of $\sqrt{N}$ has been proposed. The algorithmic approach has been extended to the case where multiple communication rounds are allowed. In this case a speed-up factor of N is obtained while the number of communication rounds is in $O(\ln 1/\epsilon)$. The authors focused on the trade-off between the number of communication rounds and the number of pulls per player. This analysis is natural when one would like to distribute the best arm identification task on a centralized processing architecture. In this case, the best arm identification tasks are synchronized and the number of communication rounds is the true cost.

The distribution of best arm identification task on MEC, that we would like to address is more challenging. When bandit algorithms are deployed close to the user's devices, the event *player is active* is modeled by an indicator random variable. Indeed, a player can choose an action only when an uncontrolled event occurs such as: the device of a user is switched on, a user has launched a mobile phone application, a user connects to a web page... Unlike in [Hillel et al (2013)], where the draw of players is controlled by the algorithm, here we consider that the players are drawn from a distribution. As a consequence, synchronized communication rounds can no longer be used to control the communication cost. Here the cost of communications is modeled by the number of transmitted bits.

In the next section, we propose a new problem setting handeling the distribution of best arm identification task between collaborative players. A lower bound of the number of transmitted bits and of the number of pulls per player is provided. Then, we propose a first algorithm, Distributed Median Elimination, which is near optimal both in terms of number of transmitted bits and in terms of number of pulls per player, and which benefits from a speed-up factor in $\mathcal{O}(N/2K \ln^2 K)$ with respect to an optimal algorithm such as Median Elimination [Even-Dar et al (2002)] run on a single player. This first algorithm requires the distribution of players to be known. Extended Distributed Median Elimination overcomes this limitation, by playing in parallel different instances of Distributed Median Elimination and selecting the best one. In the last section, experiments illustrate the analysis of proposed algorithms.

3 Problem setting

The distribution of the best arm identification task on the edge of the Radio Access Network is a collaborative game, where the players are the Mobile Edge



Fig. 1 Principle: the events are processed on the Mobile Edge Computing (MEC) application servers, and the synchronization server shares information between MEC.

Computing application servers, which cluster end-users. The players attempt to find the best arm as quickly as possible while minimizing the number of sent messages. There are two kinds of messages: the upward messages are sent from the MEC to the synchronization server, and the downward messages are sent from the synchronization server to all MEC (see Figure 1). This architecture handles the case where a context is observed before the action is chosen. The context can contain aggregated information at the MEC level or personal data stored beforehand in the device of the end-user. In the following, we focus on the case where no context is observed. We discuss the extension of the proposed algorithm to the *contextual bandit* in the last section.This architecture guarantees privacy since no event are stored. The part of the context containing personal data, which can be declarative data provided with an opt-in, are under the control of the end-user: if a context is stored in the user's device, it can be suppressed by the end-user. Furthermore, the context can be built in order to insure k-anonymity or differential privacy. The only thing that can be observed by an adversary through the core network (between the MEC and the synchronization server) is upward messages, which corresponds to aggregated information across users of one MEC server, and downward messages, which correspond to aggregated information by all MEC servers. As personal data are locally processed, the adversary has to locally deploy and maintain technical devices or software to intercept and decipher the radio communication between devices and MEC servers. For the adversary, this makes expensive the data collection task.

Let N be the number of players. To model the distribution of the best arm identification task on MEC, we assume that at each time step a player n is drawn according to a probability $P(z)$. Let $N_\gamma = |\{n \leq N, P(z = n) > \gamma\}|$ be the number of active players. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of K actions. Let $\mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^K$ be a vector of bounded random variables, y_k be the random variable denoting the reward of

the action k, and y_k^n be the random variable denoting the reward of the action k chosen by the player n. Let $P(\mathbf{y}, z)$ be the joint distribution of players and rewards.

Algorithm 1 Distributed Best Arm Identification Task

Inputs: $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$
Output: an ϵ-approximation of the best arm with probability $1-\delta$

repeat
  a player $n \sim P(z)$ is drawn
  a downward message is allowed
  an action $k \in \mathcal{A}$ is played
  a reward $y_k^n \in [0, 1]$ is received
  an upward message is allowed
until $|\mathcal{A}| = 1$

We study the distribution the best arm identification task (see Algorithm 1), when the two following assumptions hold.

Assumption 1 (best arm identification task): the mean reward of an action does not depend on the player: $\forall n \in \{1, ..., N\}$ and $\forall k \in \{1, ..., K\}$, $\mathbb{E}[y_k^n] = \mathbb{E}[y_k]$. Assumption 1 is used to restrict the studied problem to the distribution of the best arm identification task. We discuss the extension of this distribution scheme to the *contextual bandit problem* in the future works.

Assumption 2 (binary code): each transmitted message through the communication network is coded using a binary code[1]. For instance, when the synchronization server notifies to all players that the action $k = 7$ is eliminated, it sends to all players the code $'111'$.

From these assumptions, Theorem 1 states a lower bound for this new problem.

Definition 1: An ϵ-approximation of the best arm $k^* = \arg\max_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mu_k$ is an arm $k \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mu_{k^*} \leq \mu_k + \epsilon$.

Definition 2: The speed-up factor $S(A)$ of the algorithm A distributed on N players with respect to an optimal algorithm played independently on each player is defined by:

$$S(A) = \min_{i \in \{1,...,N\}} \frac{t_i^*}{t(A)},$$

where $t(A)$ is the number of samples in $P(\mathbf{y}, z)$ needed by the algorithm A to find with high probability an ϵ-approximation of the best arm, and $t_i^*(B)$ is the number of samples in $P(\mathbf{y}, z)$ needed by an optimal algorithm to find with high probability an ϵ-approximation of the best arm for the player i.

[1] a *prefix code* such as a truncated binary code or a Huffman code (see [Cover and Thomas (2006)]) would be more efficient. To simplify the exposition of ideas, we have restricted the analysis to binary code.

Theorem 1: *There exists a distribution $P(\mathbf{y}, z)$ such that, any distributed algorithm on N players needs to transmit at least $2N(K-1)\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$ bits to find with high probability an ϵ-approximation of the best arm with an optimal speed-up factor $\mathcal{O}(N)$.*

Proof Theorem 1 in [Mannor and Tsitsiklis (2004)] states that there exists a distribution $P(\mathbf{y})$ such that any algorithm needs to sample at least $\Omega\left(\frac{K}{\epsilon^2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ times to find with high probability an ϵ-approximation of the best arm. Thus, when the distribution of players is uniform, there exists a distribution $P(\mathbf{y})$ such that, any distributed algorithm on N players needs to sample at least $\Omega\left(\frac{K}{N.\epsilon^2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ times each player to find with high probability an ϵ-approximation of the best arm.

Median Elimination [Even-Dar et al (2002)] is an optimal algorithm for finding an ϵ-approximation of the best arm. Thus, the speed-up factor of any distributed algorithm cannot be higher than $\mathcal{O}(N)$. Let us assume that there exists a distributed algorithm that finds an ϵ-approximation of the best arm with a speed-up factor $\mathcal{O}(N)$, and that transmits less than $2N.(K-1)\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$ bits. There are only three possibilities to achieve this goal:
(1) a player does not transmit information about an action to the server,
(2) or the server does not transmit information about an action to a player,
(3) or this algorithm transmits less than $\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$ bits for each action.

If a player does not transmit an information about an action to the server (condition 1), then for this action the number of players is $N-1$. Thus, the speed-up factor $\mathcal{O}(N)$ cannot be reached.

If the server does not transmit information about an action to a player (condition 2), then this player does not receive information about this action from the other players. As a consequence, if the missing message concerns an action which is not an ϵ-approximation of the best arm, this player has a speed-up factor $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Thus, the number of sent messages cannot be less than $N.(K-1)$ upward messages plus $N(K-1)$ downward messages. The minimum information that can be transmitted about an action is its index. Using a binary code (see Assumption 2), the number of bits needed to transmit the index of an action cannot be less than $\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$ (condition 3). □

4 Distributed Median Elimination

4.1 Algorithm description

Now, we can derive and analyze a simple and efficient algorithm to distribute the best arm identification task (see Algorithm 3). Each player collaborates with each other by sharing the same set of remaining actions $\mathcal{A}$. When a player n is drawn, it plays a remaining action k from $\mathcal{A}$. It receives a feedback y_k^n and uses it to update its estimated mean reward $\hat{\mu}_k^n$. Rather than to transmit the estimated mean reward to other players, which would lead to use a broad bandwidth, Distributed

Algorithm 2 function MedianElimination(n)

1: **If** DownwardMessage(k) **then** $\mathcal{A}^n = \mathcal{A}^n \setminus \{k\}$
2: Play sequentially each action $k \in \mathcal{A}^n$
3: Receive y_k^n
4: $t_k^n = t_k^n + 1$, $\hat{\mu}_k^n = \frac{y_k^n}{t_k^n} + \frac{t_k^n - 1}{t_k^n}\hat{\mu}_k^n$
5: **if** $\forall k\ t_k^n \geq 4/(\epsilon_l^n)^2 \ln(3/\eta_l^n)$ **then**
6: Let m_l^n be the median of $\hat{\mu}_k^n$ such that $\lambda_k^n = 0$
7: **for** all $k \in \mathcal{A}$ **do**
8: **if** $\left(\hat{\mu}_k^n < m_l^n \textbf{ and } \lambda_k^n = 0\right)$ **then**
9: UpwardMessage(k, n), $\lambda_k^n = 1$
10: **end if**
11: **end for**
12: $\epsilon^n = 3.\epsilon^n/4$, $\eta^n = \eta^n/2$
13: **end if**

Algorithm 3 Distributed Median Elimination

1: **Inputs:** $0 < N_\gamma \leq N$, $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$
2: **Output:** an ϵ-approximation of the best arm
3: **Synchronization server:** $\forall (k, n)$, $\lambda_k^n = 0$
4: **Each player** n**:** $\eta = (\delta/2)^{\frac{2}{N_\gamma}}$, $\eta^n = \eta/2$ and $\epsilon^n = \epsilon/4$, $\mathcal{A}^n = \mathcal{A}$, $\forall k\ t_k^n = 0$, $\hat{\mu}_k^n = 0$, $\lambda_k^n = 0$
5: **repeat**
6: a player $n \sim P(z)$ is drawn
7: // Local process
8: MedianElimination(n)
9: // Synchronization server
10: **if** UpwardMessage(k, n) **then**
11: $\lambda_n^k = 1$
12: **if** $\left(\sum_n \lambda_k^n \geq N_\gamma/2\right)$ **then**
13: DownwardMessage(k), $\forall n\ \lambda_n^k = 0$
14: **end if**
15: **end if**
16: **until** $\left(\forall n, \sum_k \lambda_k^n = |\mathcal{A}| - 1\right)$

Median Elimination transmits to the synchronization server the actions k, that it would like to eliminate (Algorithm 2 function UpwardMessage(k, n) line 9). For the current player, the worst half actions are candidate for elimination when each remaining action has been played enough (Algorithm 2 condition line 5). When an upward message is received by the synchronization server from a player (Algorithm 3 function UpwardMessage(k, n) line 10), the flag λ_k^n corresponding to the tuple (action,player) is set to one. When the number of flags set to one for an action is enough high (Algorithm 3 condition line 12), the synchronization server sends this information to all players (Algorithm 3 function DownwardMessage(k) line 13), and the action is eliminated for all players (Algorithm 2 line 1).

The first part of the analysis of Distributed Median Elimination focuses on the number of pulls per player needed to find a near optimal arm with high probability. The second part of the analysis takes into account the fact that the players are drawn from an unknown distribution.

4.2 Analysis of the number of pulls per player

Theorem 2 states that the potential speed-up factor of Distributed Median Elimination is in $\mathcal{O}(N/2K\ln^2 K)$ with respect to Median Elimination [Even-Dar et al (2002)] run on each player (zero communication cost), while its communication cost is $2N(K-3/4)\lceil\log_2 K\rceil$ bits.

Theorem 2: *when $N_\gamma = N$ and $K \geq 2$ with a probability at least $1-\delta$,* Distributed Median Elimination *finds with high probability an ϵ-approximation of the best arm, transmitting less than $2N(K-3/4)\lceil\log_2 K\rceil$ bits through the communication network and using*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{2.K^2.\ln^2 K}{N.\epsilon^2}\ln\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \text{ pulls per player.}$$

Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 show that Distributed Median Elimination is near optimal both in terms of transmitted number of bits and number of pulls per player. The proof of Theorem 2 is based on the two following Lemmas.

Lemma 1: *when $N_\gamma = N$ and $K \geq 2$ with a probability at least $1-\delta$,* Distributed Median Elimination *finds an ϵ-approximation of the optimal arm, using*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{2.K^2.\ln^2 K}{N.\epsilon^2}\ln\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \text{ pulls per player.}$$

Proof Using Lemma 2 in [Even-Dar et al (2002)], we state that each single player finds an ϵ-approximation of the best arm with a failure probability η. The analysis of the sample complexity of a single player departs from the one of Median Elimination since the arms are eliminated only when the synchronization server sends an elimination message. As a consequence, even if a player would like to eliminate an arm, it still plays this arm until enough players would like to eliminate it. We take into account this fact using K as an upper bound of K_l^n. From line 5 of Algorithm 2, any player n stops after:

$$t_n^* = \sum_{l=1}^{\log_2 K} \frac{4.K_l^n}{(\epsilon_l^n)^2}\ln\frac{3}{\eta_l^n} \text{ pulls,}$$

where K_l^n is the number of actions at epoch l of the player n. We have $\eta_l^n = \eta/2^l$, $\epsilon_l^n = (3/4)^{l-1}.\epsilon/4$, and $K_l^n \leq K$. We obtain:

$$t_n^* \leq \frac{16K}{\epsilon^2}\sum_{l=1}^{\log_2 K}\left(\frac{16}{9}\right)^{l-1}\left(l\ln 2 + \ln\frac{3}{\eta}\right).$$

This implies:

$$\begin{aligned} t_n^* &\leq \frac{16K\log_2 K}{\epsilon^2}\left(\frac{16}{9}\right)^{\log_2 K}\left(\log_2 K\ln 2 + \ln\frac{3}{\eta}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{16K^2\log_2 K}{\epsilon^2}\left(\log_2 K\ln 2 + \ln\frac{3}{\eta}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{16K^2\log_2 K}{\epsilon^2}\ln\frac{3}{\eta}\left(\log_2 K + 1\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow t_n^* \leq \frac{32K^2(\log_2 K)^2}{\epsilon^2} \ln \frac{3}{\eta} \quad (1)$$

They are two possible reasons of failure when each player has been pulled t_n^* times:
(1) The set of remaining arms does not contain an ϵ-approximation of the best arm: as an arm is eliminated only when $N/2$ players would like to eliminate it (from line 12 of Algorithm 3), an ϵ-approximation of the best arm is eliminated with a probability $\eta^{N/2}$.
(2) The set of remaining arms contains a suboptimal arm: at least $N/2$ players have not eliminate a suboptimal arm with a probability $\eta^{N/2}$.

So Distributed Median Elimination fails with a probability lower than $\delta = 2\eta^{N/2}$. Replacing η by $(\frac{\delta}{2})^{\frac{2}{N}}$ in inequality 1, we provide the upper bound of the number of pulls per player. □

Lemma 2: *when $N_\gamma = N$,* Distributed Median Elimination *stops transmitting less than*

$$2N(K - 3/4)\lceil \log_2 K \rceil \text{ bits.}$$

Proof Each action is sent to the server no more than once per player. If the algorithm does not fail, at least $N/2$ players do not send the code of the best action. Thus the number of upward messages is upper bounded by $N.K - N/2$.

Then, the statement $\forall n\ \lambda_n^k = 0$ line 13 of algorithm 3 and the fact that no more than one action per player is sent to the server ensure that the synchronization server sends each suboptimal action only once. Thus the number of downward messages is $(K-1).N$.

The optimal length of a binary code needed to code an alphabet of size K is $\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$. Thus, the total number of transmitted bits is upper bounded by $2N(K - \frac{3}{4})\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$. □

4.3 Analysis of the number of draws of players

The first part of the analysis shows that the proposed algorithm benefits from a near optimal potential speed-up factor in $\mathcal{O}(\frac{N}{2K \ln^2 K})$ with respect to an optimal algorithm run on a single player. However, when the best arm identification task is distributed on Mobile Edge Computing application servers, the load of servers depends on uncontrolled events, such as a user has launched a mobile phone application. Let T^* be the time step where all the players play a near optimal arm. To obtain an upper bound with high probability of the time step T^*, we need to take into account the probability of players. The proposed algorithm (Algorithm 3) requires some knowledge of the distribution of players to set the parameter γ, which is realistic in many applications. For instance, in the case of Radio Access Network, the load of each cell or server is known, and hence the probability of each player is known. Let $\mathcal{N}_\gamma = \{n \leq N, P(z = n) > \gamma\}$ be the set of indices of active players. First, we consider the case where $N_\gamma = |\mathcal{N}_\gamma|$ is available. Theorem 3 provides an upper bound of the number of draws of players (i.e. the time steps) needed to find an ϵ-approximation of the best arm with high probability when N_γ is known.

Theorem 3: *when $K \geq 2$ with a probability at least $1 - 2.\delta$,* Distributed Median Elimination *finds an ϵ-approximation of the best arm, transmitting less than $2N(K - \frac{3}{4})\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$ bits through the communication network and using*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{K.\ln K}{\epsilon\sqrt{N_\gamma}}\left[1 + \frac{K.\ln K}{\gamma.\epsilon\sqrt{N_\gamma}}\right]\ln\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \textit{ draws of players,}$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $N_\gamma = |\{n \leq N, P(n \in \mathcal{N}_\gamma) > \gamma\}|$.

Proof Let $\mathcal{N}_\gamma = \{n \leq N, P(z = n) > \gamma\}$ be the set of indices of active players n. Let T be the time step where each player $n \in \mathcal{N}_\gamma$ has been drawn at least t times. Consider the event $n \notin \mathcal{N}_\gamma$. We have $P(n \notin N_\gamma) = 1 - \gamma$. Let f be the number of times where a player has not been drawn at time step T. f follows a negative binomial distribution with parameters t,$1 - \gamma$. By definition of the negative binomial distribution, We have:

$$\mathbb{E}[f] = \frac{(1-\gamma)t}{\gamma}$$

Using the Hoeffding's inequality, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(f - \frac{(1-\gamma)t}{\gamma} \geq \epsilon.t\right) \leq \exp(-2\epsilon^2.t^2) = \delta$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(f \geq \frac{(1-\gamma)t}{\gamma} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\delta}}\right) \leq \delta$$

Let T^* be the time step needed to obtain t^* draws of each player. The number of draws T^* is the sum of the number of draws of the less pulled player and the draws which do not contain this player. Hence, the following inequality is true with a probability $1 - 2\delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} T^* &\leq t^* + \frac{(1-\gamma)t^*}{\gamma} + \sqrt{\frac{t^*}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\delta}} \\ &\leq \frac{t^*}{\gamma} + \sqrt{\frac{t^*}{2}\log\frac{1}{\delta}} \end{aligned}$$

Then using Theorem 2 with N_γ players, and replacing t^* by its value, we provide the proof. □

5 Extended Distributed Median Elimination

5.1 Algorithm description

Notice that if N_γ is not gracefully set, the stopping time of Distributed Median Elimination is not controlled. The algorithm could not stop if $\mathcal{N}_\gamma$ contains a player with a zero probability, or could stop after a lot of time steps, if $\mathcal{N}_\gamma$

contains an unlikely player. To overcome this drawback, we propose a straightforward extension of the proposed algorithm, which consists in playing in parallel M instances of Distributed Median Elimination with equally spread values of N_γ (see Algorithm 4).

Algorithm 4 Extended Distributed Median Elimination

Inputs: $\forall i \in \{1, ..., M-1\}$ $N_{\gamma_i} = N.i/M$, $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$
Output: an ϵ-approximation of the best arm
Synchronization server: $\forall (k, n, i)$, $\lambda_k^{n_i} = 0$
Each player n**:** $\forall i$ $\eta_i = (\delta/2M)^{\frac{2}{N_{\gamma_i}}}$, $\eta^{n_i} = \eta_i/2$ and $\epsilon^{n_i} = \epsilon/4$, $\mathcal{A}^{n_i} = \mathcal{A}$, $\forall (k, i)$ $t_k^{n_i} = 0$, $\hat{\mu}_k^{n_i} = 0$, $\lambda_k^{n_i} = 0$
repeat
  a player $n \sim P(z)$ is drawn
  // Local process
  for $i \in \{1, ..., M\}$ **do**
    MedianElimination(n_i)
  end for
  // Synchronization server
  for each UpwardMessage(k, n_i) **do**
    $\lambda_{n_i}^k = 1$
  end for
  if $\left(\exists i \text{ such that } \sum_{n_i} \lambda_k^{n_i} \geq N_{\gamma_i}/2\right)$ **then**
    DownwardMessage(k), $\forall n_i$ $\lambda_{n_i}^k = 0$
  end if
until $\left(\forall n_i, \sum_k \lambda_k^{n_i} = |\mathcal{A}| - 1\right)$

5.2 Analysis

Corollary 1: *when $K \geq 2$ with a probability at least $1 - 2.\delta$,* Extended Distributed Median Elimination *finds an ϵ-approximation of the best arm, transmitting less than $2N.M(K - \frac{3}{4})\lceil \log_2 K \rceil$ bits through the communication network and using*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\min_{i \in \{1,...,M-1\}} \frac{K. \ln K}{\epsilon \sqrt{N_{\gamma_i}}} \left[1 + \frac{K. \ln K}{\gamma_i . \epsilon \sqrt{N_{\gamma_i}}}\right] \ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \textit{ draws of players,}$$

where $0 < \gamma_{M-1} \leq ... \leq \gamma_i \leq ... \leq \gamma_1 \leq 1$, and $N_{\gamma_i} = N_{\gamma_i} = N.i/M$.

Proof The proof of Corollary 1 straightforwardly comes from Theorem 3. Theorem 3 holds for each instance with a probability $1 - 2\delta/M$. Then using the union bound, Theorem 3 holds for all instances with a probability $1 - 2\delta$. The communication cost is the sum of communications of each instance, and the number of time steps needed to find a near optimal arm is the minimum of all instances. □

Extended Distributed Median Elimination handles the trade-off between the time step where all players have chosen a near optimal arm and the number of transmitted bits (see Corollary 1). In practice Extended Distributed Median Elimination can be used when the distribution of players is not known. Indeed for most of distributions of players, even if for highest values of N_γ, players with

a zero probability are selected and hence some instances do not end, the instances corresponding to smallest values of N_γ find and share a near optimal arm, using no more time steps that the best one. The cost of this good behavior is the factor M in the communication cost.

6 Experiments

6.1 Experimental setting

In order to illustrate the analysis of Distributed Median Elimination and its potential application for Mobile Edge Computing, in this section we provide and discuss some experiments done with a simulated environment.

Despite the fact that in the previous sections, we analyzed the sample complexity of the proposed algorithm, which is natural for the best arm identification problem, in the experiments we plot regret curves. Indeed, the pseudo-regret over time and players finely captures the difference of performances between the optimal arm and the one played by a distributed algorithm:

$$R(T) = \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mu_{k^*} - \mathbb{E}[y_{k_t} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{z=n_t}] = \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mu_{k^*} - \mu_{k_t}^{n_t} \ ,$$

where k_t is the action played by the drawn player n_t at time t.

Median Elimination is a fixed-design algorithm that outputs an ϵ-approximation of the best arm after the same number of pulls whatever the problem. Distributed Median Elimination is an explore-then-commit strategy (see [Perchet et al (2015)] for a formal description), which uses a data dependent stopping test (Algorithm 3 line 12) to eliminate sub-optimal actions. It has been shown that even if explore-then-commit strategies can be rate optimal for the regret minimization problem, they are sub-optimal for the two-armed bandits by a factor 2 [Garivier et al (2016)]. That is why to illustrate and complete the analysis of the proposed algorithm, we compare Distributed Median Elimination on regret minimization problems using three baselines : Median Elimination [Even-Dar et al (2002)] played independently on each player and Median Elimination with an unlimited communication cost ($64T \times \log_2 K$) illustrate the interest and the limits of the distribution approach, and UCB [Auer et al (2002)a] with an unlimited communication cost is used as a benchmark for the two regret minimization problems.

Problem 1. There are 10 arms. The optimal arm has a mean reward $\mu_0 = 0.7$, the second one $\mu_1 = 0.5$, the third one $\mu_2 = 0.3$, and the other have a mean reward of 0.1. The problem 1, where a few number of arms have high mean rewards and the other low mean rewards, is easy for an explore-then-commit strategy such as Distributed Median Elimination and for a fully-sequential approach such as UCB.

Problem 2. There are 10 arms. The optimal arm has a mean reward $\mu_0 = 0.3$, the second one $\mu_1 = 0.2$, and the other have a mean reward of 0.1. With regard to this more difficult problem, where the gap between arms is tighter, explore-then-commit and fully-sequential algorithms will need more steps to play frequently the best arm. In contrast, Median Elimination is a fixed-design approach: whatever the problem, it spends the same number of steps in exploration.

For highlighting the interest of using Distributed Median Elimination for the proposed problem setting (see Figure 1 and Algorithm 1) and for ensuring a fair comparison between algorithms, two distribution of players are tested.

Uniform distribution. Each player has a probability equal to $1/N$. In this case, the knowledge of the distribution of players does not provide any particular benefit for Distributed Median Elimination: N_γ is set to N, which is known by all blind algorithms. This case corresponds to the worst case for Distributed Median Elimination.

20% *of players generates* 80% *of events.* The players are part in two groups of sizes N_γ and $N - N_\gamma$. When a player is drawn, a uniform random variable $x \in [0, 1]$ is drawn. If $x < 0.8$ the player belongs from the first group, and else from the second one. In this case, the knowledge of the distribution provides a useful information for setting N_γ. N_γ is set to $0.2 \times N$. This knowledge, which corresponds to the number of most active players, is available for cells in a Radio Access Network.

For all the experiments, ϵ is set to 0.5, δ is set to 0.05, and the time horizon is 10^6. All the regret curves are averaged over 100 trials.

6.2 Discussion

We notice that the number of transmitted bits is zero for Median Elimination played independently on each player, 740 for Distributed Median Elimination, and 2.56×10^8 for Median Elimination and UCB with unlimited communication cost. In comparison to algorithms with unlimited communication cost, Distributed Median Elimination needs 10^6 times less bits to process a million of decisions: the communication cost of Distributed Median Elimination does not depend on the time horizon (see Lemma 2).

The number of players versus the regret at time horizon 10^6 is plotted for the two problems when the distribution of players is uniform (see Figures 2a and 3a). Firstly, we observe that whatever the number of players Distributed Median Elimination is outperformed by Median Elimination with an unlimited communication cost. For 1024 players, the expected number of events per player is lower than one thousand: Distributed Median Elimination and Median Elimination performed on each player does not end the first elimination epoch. Secondly, for less than 1024 players, Distributed Median Elimination clearly outperforms Median Elimination with a zero communication cost.



(a) The number of players versus the regret at time horizon 10^6



(b) The time horizon versus the regret for 64 players

Fig. 2 Problem 1 - Uniform distribution of players



(a) The number of players versus the regret at time horizon 10^6



(b) The time horizon versus the regret for 64 players

Fig. 3 Problem 2 - Uniform distribution of players



(a) The number of players versus the regret at time horizon 10^6



(b) The time horizon versus the regret for 64 players

Fig. 4 Problem 1 - 20% of players generates 80% of events

The regret versus time step is plotted for the two problems using 64 players which are uniformely distributed (see Figures 2b and 3b). For the first problem (see Figure 2b), where the gap is large, UCB with an unlimited communication cost benefits from its fully-sequential approach: it outperforms clearly Median Elimination. The second problem (see Figure 3b) is more difficult since the gap is tighter. As a consequence, the difference in perfomances between UCB and

Median Elimination is small. Distributed Median Elimination significantly outperforms Median Elimination with zero communication cost on both problems.



(a) The number of players versus the regret at time horizon 10^6



(b) The time horizon versus the regret for 64 players

Fig. 5 Problem 2 - 20% of players generates 80% of events

When the distribution of players is not uniform, we observe that the gap in performances between Median Elimination with an unlimited communication cost and Distributed Median Elimination is reduced (see Figures 4a and 5a). In comparison to Median Elimination played on each player, Distributed Median Elimination exhibits a nice behavior: when the most active players have found an ϵ-approximation of the best arm, the sharing of information allows to eliminate the sub-optimal arms for infrequent players which are numerous (see Figure 4b and 5b). As a consequence, the gap in performances between Distributed Median Elimination and Median Elimination played on a single player is increased.



(a) Problem 1



(b) Problem 2

Fig. 6 The parameter N_γ versus the regret when 20% of players generates 80% of events

To illustrate the interest of Extended Distributed Median Elimination when the knowledge of the distribution of players is not available, the value of the parameter N_γ versus the regret at the time horizon is plotted (see Figure 6).

When 20% of players generates 80% of events, Distributed Median Elimination outperforms Median Elimination run on each player for a wide range of values of the parameter N_γ. However, when N_γ is overestimated, the speed-up factor with respect to Median Elimination run on each player can be lesser than one. Without the knowledge of the true value of the parameter ($N_\gamma = 51$), by selecting the best instance Extended Distributed Median Elimination significantly outperforms Median Elimination run on each player.

7 Conclusion an future works

In order to distribute the best identification task as close as possible to the user's devices, we have proposed a new problem setting, where the players are drawn from a distribution. This architecture guarantees privacy to the users since no data are stored and the only thing that can be observed by an adversary through the core network is aggregated information over users. When the distribution of players is known, we provided and analyzed a first algorithm for this problem: Distributed Median Elimination. We have showed that its communication cost is near optimal in terms of transmitted number of bits, while the number of pulls per player is near optimal. Then, we have proposed Extended Distributed Median Elimination, which handles the case where the distribution of players is unknown. In four illustrative experiments, we have compared the proposed algorithm with three baselines: Median Elimination with zero and unlimited communication costs, and UCB with an unlimited communication cost. According to the theoretical analysis, Distributed Median Elimination clearly outperforms Median Elimination with a zero communication cost. Finally, this distribution approach provides a speed-up factor linear in terms of number of Mobile Edge Computing application server, facilitates privacy by processing data close to the end-user, and its communication cost, which does not depend on the time horizon, allows to control the load of the telecommunication network while deploying a lot of decision applications on the edge of the Radio Access Network.

These results are obtained when Assumption 1 holds: the mean reward of actions does not depend on the player. Future works will extend this distributed approach to the case where Assumption 1 does not hold, and in particular for the contextual bandit problem. Indeed, Distributed Median Elimination is a basic block, which can be extended to the selection of variables to build a distributed decision stump and then a distributed version of Bandit Forest [Féraud et al (2016)].

References

References

Auer et al (2002)a. Auer, P., Cesa Bianchi, N., Fischer, P.: Finite-time Analysis of the Multiarmed Bandit Problem, Machine Learning,47, 235-256, 2002.

Auer et al (2002)b. Auer, P., Cesa-Bianchi, N., Freund, Y., Schapire, R. E.: The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem, SIAM J. COMPUT., 32 48-77, 2002.

Babcock et al (2002). Babcock, B., Babu, S., Datar, M., Motwani, R. and Widom, J.: Models and Issues in Data Stream Systems, ACM SIGMOD, 2002

Beringer et Hüllermeier (2002). Beringer, J. and Hüllermeier, E.: Online clustering of parallel data streams, IData & Knowledge Engineering, 58(2):180-204, 2006

Bubeck et al (2009). Bubeck, S., Wang, T., Stoltz: Pure exploration in multi-armed bandits problems, COLT, 2009.

Chu et al (2011). Chu, W., Li, L., Reyzin, L., Shapire, R. E.: Contextual Bandits with Linear Payoff Functions, AISTATS, 2011.

Cover and Thomas (2006). Cover, T. M., Joy A. Thomas, T. A.: Elements of Information Theory, Wiley-Interscience, 2006.

Domingos and Hulten (2002). Domingos, P., Hulten, G.: Mining high-speed data streams, KDD, 71-80, 2000.

Even-Dar et al (2002). Even-Dar, E., Mannor, S., Mansour Y.: PAC Bounds for Multi-armed Bandit and Markov Decision Processes, COLT, 255-270, 2002.

Féraud et al (2016). Féraud, R., Allesiardo, R., Urvoy, T., Clérot, F.: Random Forest for the Contextual Bandit Problem, AISTATS, 2016.

Gabillon et al (2013). Gabillon, V., Ghavamzadeh M., Lazaric, A., Best Arm Identification: A Unified Approach to Fixed Budget and Fixed Confidence, NIPS, 2013.

Garivier et al (2016). Garivier, A., Kaufmann, E., Lattimore, T.: On Explore-Then-Commit Strategies, NIPS, 2016.

Hillel et al (2013). Hillel, E., Karnin, Z., Koren, T. Lempel, R., Somekh, O.: Distributed Exploration in Multi-Armed Bandits, NIPS, 2013.

Ganta et al (2008). Ganta, S., R., Kasiviswanathan, S., P. and Smith, A. Composition attacks and auxiliary information in data privacy, KDD, 2008.

Kanade et al (2012). Kanade, V., Liu Z., Radunovìc, B.: Distributed Non-Stochastic Experts, NIPS, 2012.

Kaufman et al (2012). Kaufman, E., Korda, N., Munos, R.: Thompson sampling: An asymptotically optimal finite time analysis, COLT, 2012.

Mannor and Tsitsiklis (2004). Mannor, S., and Tsitsiklis, J. N.: The Sample Complexity of Exploration in the Multi-Armed Bandit Problem, JMLR, 2004

MEC white paper (2014). Mobile Edge Computing Introductory Technical White Paper, etsi.org, 2014-09-01.

Sarwate and Chaudhuri (2013). Anand D. Sarwate and Kamalika Chaudhuri: Signal Processing and Machine Learning with Differential Privacy, IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 2013

Perchet et al (2015). Perchet, V., Rigollet, P., Chassang, S., Snowberg, E.: Batched Bandit Problems, The Annals of Statistics,Vol. 44, No. 2, 2016.

Sweeney (2002). Sweeney, L.: k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy, International Journal on Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge based Systems, 10(5):557-570, 2002.

Soare et al (2014). Soare, M., Lazaric, L., Munos, R.: Best-Arm Identification in Linear Bandits, NIPS, 2014.

Szörényi et al (2013). Szörényi, B., Busa-Fekete, R., Hegedũs, I., Ormàndi, R., Jelasity, M., Kègl, B.: Gossip-based distributed stochastic bandit algorithms, ICML, 2013.

Urvoy et al (2013). Urvoy, T., Clérot, F., Féraud, R., Naamane, S.: Generic Exploration and K-armed Voting Bandits, ICML, 2013.

Vailant (1984). Valiant, L.: A theory of the learnable, Communications of the ACM, 27, 1984.